

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1. This sheet, which includes Figs. 1 and 2, replaces the original sheet including Figs. 1 and 2. In Figure 1, the arrows designated with numeral 18 have been changed to numeral 17.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet
 Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS

Claims 1, 18, 29 and 52 are amended. Claims 1-71 are in the application for consideration.

Paragraph 27 of the specification and claims 29 and 52 are amended to correct typographical errors. Entry of the same is requested.

Paragraph 23 of the specification is amended to refer to arrows 17. A substitute sheet bearing Fig. 1 is filed herewith, wherein the arrows designated with numeral 18 have been changed to numeral 17. Numeral 18 is used in other figures in reference to photoresist. Entry of the specification amendment to paragraph 23 and entry of the substitute drawing sheet is respectfully requested.

Claims 18, 51 and 71 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 18 has been so amended, and accordingly should be formally allowed. Claims 51 and 71 have not been so amended herein as it is argued herein that the base claims from which such depend are allowable as-worded.

Independent claim 1 is amended to recite the patterning and developing of the photoresist to form a patterned photoresist layer having laterally projecting feet proximate the semiconductor substrate outer surface. Support for the same is inherent in Applicant's application as-filed, for example as shown in Fig. 3. Accordingly, claim 1 recites in combination

at least the treating of the outer surface with the basic fluid and the formation of a patterned photoresist layer having laterally projecting feet proximate the semiconductor substrate outer surface. Such is neither shown nor suggested by Duval. Indeed, Duval essentially teaches the exact opposite.

Specifically, treatment methods in accordance with the Duval teaching are shown in Figs. 2A-2F and everywhere have a reentrant profile which is the opposite of formation of Applicant's independent claim 1-recited laterally projecting feet. Duval does disclose at col.7, Ins.17-20 the possibility of forming vertical profiles, but in no way teaches or suggests forming laterally projecting feet. Specifically, Duval teaches removal of the prior art feet depicted in its Fig. 1. Accordingly, Applicant recites something in independent claim 1 which is neither shown nor suggested in Duval, and Duval teaches the exact opposite. Accordingly, Applicant's independent claim 1 as amended should be allowed, and action to that end is requested.

Applicant's independent claims 30 and 53 in their respective claim combinations recite formation of a patterned photoresist layer having increased footing at a base region of said layer than would otherwise occur in the absence of said treating of the outer surface. The Examiner rejects such claims as being anticipated by Duval. The Examiner is mistaken.

Specifically, Duval describes an exemplary prior art or control wafer in Fig. 1, with every aspect of its invention in Figs. 2A-2F and in the specification at col.7, Ins.17-20 depicting elimination of the Fig. 1 footing.

Thereby, the opposite of what Applicant claims, namely increased footing, occurs by the Duval treatment. Therefore, Applicant's independent claims 30 and 53 recite something which is not found within the teachings of Duval, and the anticipation rejection must be withdrawn for this reason. Action to that end is requested.

Applicant's dependent claims should be allowed as depending from allowable base claims, and for their own recited features which are neither shown nor suggested in the cited art. Action to that end is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6-2-05

By: 

Mark S. Matkin
Reg. No. 32,268



ANNOTATED SHEET SHOWING CHANGES

1/3

